

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today or tomorrow the House will consider a privileged resolution I have introduced calling on the Ethics Committee to release the report of the outside counsel investigating Speaker NEWT GINGRICH. I would like to read the text of that privileged resolution:

Whereas on December 6, 1995, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct agreed to appoint an outside counsel to conduct an independent, nonpartisan investigation of allegations of ethical misconduct by Speaker Newt Gingrich;

Whereas, after an eight-month investigation, that outside counsel has submitted an extensive document containing the results of his inquiry;

Whereas the report of the outside counsel cost the taxpayers \$500,000;

Whereas the public has a right—and members of Congress have a responsibility—to examine the work of the outside counsel and reach an independent judgment concerning the merits of the charges against the Speaker;

Whereas these charges have been before the Ethics Committee for more than two years:

Whereas a failure of the Committee to release the outside counsel's report before the adjournment of the 104th Congress will seriously undermine the credibility of the Ethics Committee and the integrity of the House of Representatives;

Therefore be it resolved that—

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall immediately release to the public the outside counsel's report on Speaker Newt Gingrich, including any conclusions, recommendations, attachments, exhibits or accompanying material.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT MUST COMPLETE ITS WORK

(Mr. GUNDERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] earlier, are absolutely correct. I would like to join my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in publicly stating that the American people and this Congress have not only the right, but we as representatives of those people have the responsibility to see the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct complete its process, when it is complete. I repeat, when it is complete.

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, chaired by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], our colleague, has conducted this investigation in accordance with the rules established by this House.

When the committee has completed its responsibilities, I am confident that the report will be made public and then the American people and the House of Representatives will have the opportunity and the responsibility to respond to those conclusions.

Until such time, I would call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to

let the rules of the House and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct complete its task and its responsibility. I believe that will be done properly.

HOW LONG DOES IT TAKE FOR A REASONABLE INVESTIGATION?

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I listen to my words of my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], and I would agree with him that clearly we do not want any half-baked anything here. But as I get ready to leave this body, I am beginning to think about what I could will to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and I am thinking about willing them an outbox. I guess the question is, how long does it take for a reasonable investigation? Our problem is 2 years seems like a very long time.

In the past, and we can bring those charts to the floor except they probably would be ruled out of order, but we have charts showing that all sorts of serious complaints before were dealt with in a matter of weeks or months, and sometimes days. But 2 years, 2 long years? And there is some suspicion that we may not see this until after the term is over and that people will then think, oh, well, it is moot now and we start all over again.

I think, if that happens, this body will really be operating under a very dark cloud.

"DEAR COLLEAGUE" LETTER FROM THE PAST APPLIES TO PRESENT ETHICS COMMITTEE SITUATION

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, three of the previous speakers, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], were all signatories to a letter that goes directly to this point that they are now arguing the other side of with respect to disclosure from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. It was written just a few short years ago.

Mr. Speaker, it says:

As the Ethics Committee prepares its recommendations to the full House, it should only release the information which the Committee agrees is relevant and necessary to support its findings.

Why is that? Because, it goes on, to ask a Member, any Member, to also respond in the court of public opinion to allegations, rumors and innuendo not deemed worthy of charge by the Committee would be totally unfair and a perversion of the process. Especially in a time of press sensationalism.

Public release of material not germane to formal Committee action

In the Wright case,

would be similar to the process used during the Joe McCarthy era: Ignore the discipline of the process and firm evidence and dump unproven allegations out in public and let the ensuing publicity destroy the person's reputation and character.

THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one second?

Mr. WYNN. I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to respond that in the Wright case it took 2 weeks to get a special counsel, and in the Gingrich case we talked about 15 months. I think there is a great difference. Thank you.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, people often wonder: Is there a difference between Democrats and Republicans? There absolutely is. That difference is being played out in the closing weeks of this year's session.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are trying to get more money for education, about \$3.1 billion for education and job training. No, it will not unbalance the budget. The budget will be fine. But it will enable us to provide funds for basic math and reading skills. Head Start, summer jobs for kids, dislocated worker assistance, school-to-work initiatives, and Pell grants for college students.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of rhetoric about our children's future. The Democrats care about our children's future. That is why we are fighting for education. The American people want more Federal support for education. Strapped local and State governments want more money for education.

We have an opportunity in the closing weeks of this session to provide that assistance without affecting the budget. We ought to do it.

Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between the Democrats and Republicans: Democrats favor aid to education.

THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION RETREATS

(Mr. MILLER of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, after a decade of progress under Ronald Reagan and George Bush, Bill Clinton is leading the full-scale retreat on the war on drugs.

Upon arriving in the White House, Bill Clinton began by dismantling the war on drugs. He began by slashing the U.S. military's drug interdiction budget by 1,000 positions. In February 1993,